

REMARKS

Claims 2 and 4-19 are pending in this application. Claims 5, 16, and 18 stand rejected. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the indication of allowance of claims 17 and 19. By this Amendment, claim 16 has been amended and claim 20 has been added. The amendments made to claim 16 do not alter the scope of this claim, nor have these amendments been made to define over the prior art. Rather, the amendments to claim 16 have been made for cosmetic reasons to improve the form thereof. In light of the amendments and remarks set forth below, Applicants respectfully submit that each of the pending claims is in immediate condition for allowance.

The Examiner rejected claims 4, 4-5, 16, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In accordance with the Examiner's remarks, and to more clearly define the invention, Applicant has amended claim 16. As a result, Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Independent claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,567,244 ("Gill") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,710,986 ("Sato"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Among the limitations of independent claim 16 not present in either Gill or Sato is one of the upper and lower magnetic layers in the pair of magnetic tunnel junction structures is electrically connected to one of the upper and lower magnetic layers in the other magnetic tunnel junction structure via the upper electrode in the other magnetic tunnel junction structure.

Neither Gill nor Sato discloses the above quoted limitation. Neither of the cited references discloses a magnetic resistance device comprising two pairs of physically separated magnetic tunnel junction structures wherein there is an electrical

connection between the two physically separated magnetic tunnel junction structures between one of the pair of magnetic layers in the first tunnel junction structure to one of the pair of magnetic layers in the other magnetic tunnel junction structure via an upper electrode in the other magnetic tunnel junction structure. As such, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim 2, 4, 5, and 18 depend from, and contain all the limitations of claim 16. These dependent claims also recite additional limitations which, in combination with the limitations of claim 16, are neither disclosed nor suggested by Gill and are also believed to be directed towards the patentable subject matter. Thus, claims 2, 4, 5, and 18 should also be allowed.

Applicants have responded to all of the rejections and objections recited in the Office Action. Reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance for all of the pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

Application No.: 09/777,325

Docket No.: X2007.0079

If the Examiner believes an interview would be of assistance, the Examiner is welcome to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Dated: May 20, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By
Ian R. Blum

Registration No.: 42,336
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY
LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 835-1400
Attorneys for Applicant

IRB/mgs